

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/863,326	05/24/2001	Frank Chen	CHEN3210/EM/6828	1031

23364 7590 08/06/2004

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 SLATERS LANE
FOURTH FLOOR
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KING, JUSTIN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2111

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/863,326

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Justin I. King

Art Unit

2111

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2111

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459

(1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-3, 5 and 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Olander, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,161,031), in view of Vinson et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,453,334), and in further view of Kannan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,815,702).

Referring to claim 1: Olander discloses a programmable calculator including an input unit and output unit (figure 1). Olander's calculator is capable of calculating algebraic statement (claim 1), thus, Olander's processor, which calculating the algebraic statement is the claimed algebraic logic processor. Olander further discloses an interrupt detector (figure 3B, structure 65). Olander's calculator is capable of displaying and prompting user the executing status and error, and user can choose whether to suppress program halt and the error message (claim 6,

Art Unit: 2111

column 2, lines 8-14). When Olander's calculator detects the error, halts the program, and prompts the error message, it sends an interrupt to the interrupt detector; such interrupt is the claimed request to stop processing.

Olander does not explicitly disclose a counter for counting based on a predefined value, and Olander does not explicitly disclose that the processor continues processing the request while waiting user's input.

Vinson discloses a system processing method, which terminates the process at the timeout (figure 2D, steps 258, 260); and Vincent further teaches that it is known to prompt user the option where to reset the timer for additional time (column 8, lines 43-50). The means in Vincent's teaching, which receives "No" from user on the prompted options, is the claimed internal interrupt detector for detecting a request to stop processing.

Although Vinson teaches that it is known to prompt user the option where to reset the timer for additional time, Vincent does not explicitly disclose whether the processor stops processing the task while prompting user the option. Kannan discloses that it is known not to stop the processing or application when an exception/interrupt is raised and user is prompted (abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Vinson and Kannan onto Olander because Vinson teaches one to properly allocate system resources by prompting user for additional time at the timeout and have user to determine whether additional time is legitimate for further processing, and Kannan teaches one to continue processing while exception is raised so user can save unsaved data and the processing resource won't be wasted while waiting for user's input.

Art Unit: 2111

Referring to claim 2: Vinson discloses that the counter is reset and the terminating message (timeout) is clear (column 8, lines 43-50). None of the prior arts discloses the second predefined value. The second predefined value is the time for user to response to the option before the system selects the default value. An "Official Notice" is taken on that a preset length of time for user to select the options before the system enters the default value is well known, for example, the Microsoft® Windows® NT will prompt user to select the system/OS mode and it will select the default value if user does not select any option within a predefined time frame, and this Official Notice is not challenged by the Applicant on the paper dated June 14, 2004.

Referring to claim 3: The processor will process the task the same for either before the counter expired or after the counter reset; thus, the output unit will display the same message representing the processing after the stopping message is cleared as it does before the stopping message is generated.

Referring to claim 5: The external interrupt detector for detecting whether a specific key of the input unit is pressed by the user, is a known feature in the computer art. Under the Microsoft® Windows® environment, the Alt + Ctrl + Delete combination brings up a system window for the user to terminate any process. Under some Unix environments, the Ctrl + C combination will halt the processing and wait for user's further instruction. Thus, the means for receiving these keyboard input is the claimed external interrupt detector.

Referring to claim 7: Olander discloses a programmable calculator including an input unit and output unit (figure 1). Olander's calculator is capable of calculating algebraic statement (claim 1), thus, Olander's processor, which calculating the algebraic statement is the claimed algebraic logic processor. Olander further discloses an interrupt detector (figure 3B, structure

Art Unit: 2111

65). Olander's calculator is capable of displaying and prompting user the executing status and error, and user can choose whether to suppress program halt and the error message (claim 6, column 2, lines 8-14). When Olander's calculator detects the error, halts the program, and prompts the error message, it sends an interrupt to the interrupt detector; such interrupt is the claimed request to stop processing.

Olander does not explicitly disclose a counter for counting based on a predefined value, and Olander does not explicitly disclose that the processor continues processing the request while waiting user's input.

Vinson discloses a system processing method, which terminates the process at the timeout (figure 2D, steps 258, 260); and Vincent further teaches that it is known to prompt user the option for further instruction (column 8, lines 43-50).

Although Vinson teaches that it is known to prompt user the option for further instruction, Vincent does not explicitly disclose whether the processor stops processing the task while prompting user the option. Kannan discloses that it is known not to stop the processing or application when an exception/interrupt is raised and user is prompted (abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art to adapt the teachings of Vinson and Kannan onto Olander because Vinson teaches one to properly allocate system resources by prompting user for additional time at the timeout and have user to determine whether additional time is legitimate for further processing, and Kannan teaches one to continue processing while exception is raised so user can save unsaved data and the processing resource won't be wasted while waiting for user's input.

Referring to claim 8: Claim 8 is rejected as the claim 2's argument stated above.

Art Unit: 2111

Referring to claim 9: Claim 9 is rejected as the claim 3's argument stated above.

Referring to claim 10: Claim 10 is rejected as the claim 5's argument stated above.

4. Claims 6 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olander in view of Vinson, and in further view of Kannan and Andrew Stanenbaum's "Structured Computer Organization".

Referring to claims 6 and 11: Olander is capable of handling the algebraic expression. IN every algebraic expression, the parentheses have the precedent over any mathematical expression, and the multiplication and division have the precedent over the addition and subtraction. Thus, the basic algebraic expression validation is the claimed determining means for whether the input expression confirms to algebraic logic rules, and the following calculation is the claimed calculating means for calculating the expression. Although the prior art does not explicitly disclose separate hardware in handling these two steps, Stanenbaum discloses that it is known that hardware and software are logically equivalent. Hence, it would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the computer art at the time Applicant made the invention to adapt the Stanenbaum's teaching onto Olander, Vinson, and Kannan because Stanenbaum teaches one to interchange hardware and software according to the factors of cost, speed, reliability, and frequency of expected changes.

Response to Arguments

5. In response to Applicant's argument that the prior arts on record do not disclose or teach the claimed invention, whether considered individually or in any reasonable combination: The

Art Unit: 2111

prior arts on record do not individually disclose or teach the claimed invention, thus, the office rejection is 103(a) rejection rather than 102 rejection. The prior arts on record with reasonable combination of the teachings do disclose or teach the claimed limitations. Applicant argues that the claimed invention stops processing only when a user responds positively to a termination query (Remark, page 7, paragraph 3, lines 4-5). The prior art Kannan discloses that it is known to stop the processing only when a user responds positively to a prompt (abstract's last 5 lines).

6. In response to Applicant's argument that Vinson's prompting for additional time is actually the opposite of the claimed invention (Remark, page 9, first paragraph): Vinson discloses that it is known to prompt users the **options for further instructions**. This teaching is not opposite to the claimed invention. The office action uses the teaching of the **options for further instructions** to reject the claimed invention. As indicated in the office action, Vinson does not disclose or explicitly teach the continuing processing, which is taught by Kannan.

7. In response to Applicant's argument that Kannan's termination of processing when a fatal error is executed irrespective of user wishes (Remark, page 9, last paragraph): The office action did not use Kannan's fatal error handling to reject the claimed invention. Kannan teaches that it is known to stop the processing only when a user responds positively to a prompt (abstract's last 5 lines). The office action uses the teaching of the **stopping the processing only when a user responds positively to a prompt** to reject the claimed invention.

8. In response to Applicant's argument that none of the prior art discloses or teaches prompting a user for termination within a predetermined amount of time even though no error has occurred (Remark, page 10, 2nd paragraph): Vinson teaches that it is known to prompt the user the option for further instruction after a predetermined amount of time. Vinson's time-out,

Art Unit: 2111

as a predetermined amount of time, is not an error. Kannan teaches that it is known to stop the processing only when a user responds positively to a prompt. Thus, the prior arts on record do suggest the claimed limitations.

Art Unit: 2111

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2111


10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin King whose telephone number is (703) 305-4571. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 9:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephones are unsuccessfully, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Reinhart can be reached at (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose number is (703)-306-5631.



Justin King
July 26, 2004



XUAN M. THAI
PRIMARY EXAMINER
TC2100